

Michael-Trent: Barnes, ex-rel.
 RES: MICHAEL TRENT BARNES®
 U.C.C. NO. 2004-212509
 Care of Postal Service Address
 U.S.P.C. #95007-022
 P.O. Box 6000
 Sheridan, Oregon [97378]

JUL 18 2007
 at 9 o'clock and 10 min. M
 SUE BEITIA, CLERK

DENIED
Susan Qui Mollway
 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 Plaintiff,

vs.

MICHAEL L. BARNES, in error
 MICHAEL TRENT BARNES, in error
 Michael-Trent: Barnes, Defendant
 in fact, Common Law [C]itizen

U.S.D.C. No. 03-00502-SOM.

Date: _____

Time: _____

Challenge to territorial
 jurisdiction claimed by
 this Court, Brought by the
 in proper persona, Defendant
 in fact, Common Law [C]itizen.

INDEPENDENT MOTION CHALLENGING

THE CLAIM OF TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION

"A CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENT"

TO ALL INTERESTED PARTIES:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE BY THESE PRESENTS: That a Challenge to the claimed territorial jurisdiction, a judicial hearing has been commanded/requested to ascertain, and place upon the court record, the information which establishes this court's lawful territorial Authority/Jurisdiction upon which this court proceeded upon the alleged criminal matter. This Challenge shall be held at the first available time, and conducted by the first available Article III Judge of Law, sitting in a judicial capacity in the Court located at Honolulu, Hawaii (see file stamp date by Court Clerk). Said hearing is a Constitutionally required, for lawful process of law, and shall be held in a timely manner in the interest of justice.

COMMAND FOR AN ARTICLE III JUDICIAL OFFICER

Michael-Trent, the Defendant in fact, an American National, a Common Law California [C]itizen from the family of Barnes, has independently Challenged the territorial jurisdiction claimed by this court in this alleged criminal matter. Herein Commands that only an Article III Judicial Officer (Judge of Law) operating as such hear this Motion.

An Article III Judge is defined as follows:

- a.] Judges of both the Supreme Court and Inferior Courts who receive for their services, which is not diminished durring their continuance in office.
- b.] Judges of both the Supreme Court and Inferior Courts, holding office durring good behavior.

A FUNDAMENTAL FAILURE OF DUE PROCESS RIGHTS OCCURED:

Due process has failed in this matter, as this court's jurisdiction has been challenged, priviously and ignored by the court. This fundamental flaw of due process, the "Onus Probendi"/"Burden of Proof", rested squarely upon the shoulders of the prosecution, agents of the United States Attorney's office of the Department of Justice.

It is Constitutional mandatory requirement that a Court have lawfull "Authority/Jurisdiction", to bring a matter/case before the court, or all Acts, Orders, and Judgements rendered are Null and Void ab initio! The record is void of any proof of the alleged crime taking place within the United States territorial jurisdiction, the onus probendi, burden of proof has never been placed upon the record. It is in fact the defendant in fact, posistion that the prosecution will not be able to prove the needed lawful territorial jurisdiction to of brought this matter/case in the first place. That agents of the Department of Justice did willfully operate outside of the lawful Constitutional boundries established.

The prosecution used "Color of Law, authority, office and process" in its intentional mis-application of statutes in this matter/case.

It now behoves the prosecution and this court to show upon the record the alleged ownership of the property in question, the surrendered Authority/Jurisdiction from the State, and acceptance of the jurisdiction by the United States as is Constitutionally required, under your Title 40 U.S.C. Section 255.

This Independent Motion is a Direct Challenge to the claimed territorial jurisdiction of this court to of heard this matter/case. This commanded/requested territorial jurisdiction hearing is called to resolve certain false assumption or presumptions and or conclusions of law, which are at controversy and in dispute. The court has errored, by not proving and placing its territorial jurisdiction upon the record, which is a Constitutional requirement, as "Where a federal court is without jurisdiction of the offense, judgement of conviction of the court and or jury is void ab initio, on its face". Bauman v. U.S., 156 F.2d. 534 (5th Cir. 1946). The limits of jurisdiction apply both to federal legislative acts and criminal prosecutions. Authority/Jurisdiction must be acquired by the land, being the property owned by the federal government. No claim has been made that the alleged crime took place on any federal lands subject to the legislative and judicial jurisdiction of the United States (District of Columbia).

The subject matter jurisdiction is not in question here. But rather, the claimed territorial jurisdiction, and the nature of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii and its claim to having criminal jurisdiction in this alleged matter/case. Which involved a compelled performance by the defendant in fact, Michael-Trent an American National upon the land of Hawaii.

It is a well known fact of law, that jurisdiction may be challenged

at any time, as an issue of law, when challenged it must be placed upon the record. Absent jurisdictional authority all Acts, Orders and or Judgements issued or undertaken are null and void ab initio.

Because the Defendant in fact was compelled, by threats, force and fraud and only entered the court under duress. Gives Notice that this and any appearance is SPECIAL, and not general in nature. The Court is given Notice of injury and damage caused by the prosecutions use of "Color of law, authority, office, process" and its intentional mis-application of statute.

The "ARGUMENT", which follows, sets forth the nature of the controversy. This Courts Article III judge is bound by Oath and Bond of Office to sit upon the law side of this controversy to declare the truth of the jurisdiction in a neutral capacity and to make a fair and impartial determination. Upon the claimed ownership over the land in question and under who's jurisdiction it falls.

This argument and documents contained herein, is intended to be the basis for further action/claims on appeal or Tort action should this Court's Article III judge fail to afford a complete hearing on the Law of this matter upon the Notice Challenging the territorial jurisdiction in this matter/case. Failure of this Court to establish its claim of territorial jurisdiction upon the record, in a timely manner shall cause the defendant in fact to file for a Writ of Prohibition in a higher court.

ARGUMENT A

[A] Territorial Jurisdiction of the United States
is established under Article I, Section 8, Clause 17

The "Onus Probendi" is upon the shoulders of the prosecution agents of the United States Department of Justice, they will utterly fail to meet the requirements "Burden of Proof"/"Onus Probendi" as no

documentation exists that would grant ownership of the alleged land where the alleged criminal act is claimed to of taken place. No prove can be presented that the United States owned the land, nor that the State ceaded its jurisdiction to it, nor that the jurisdiction was accepted by the federal government as required under your Title 40 § 255.

An employee of the United States falsely submitted allegations using fictious name(s), in what amounts to a "Bill of Pains and Penalties" alleging that I Michael-Trent, the defendant in fact of somehow failed to preform according to terms of some unknown agreement or contract, for a specific performance on my part. The individual(s) in question did mis-apply statute, has accused me of failing to preform specifically to some statute of the District of Columbia's Food and Drug Administration which was being presented as a general law. Statutes (codes) are not Laws in general, they are administrative regulations that are civil in nature, the claims of a "criminal case" was and is fraud and misleading. This action was outside of the lawful jurisdiction of the District of Columbia known as the United States, and was nothing short of use of "Color of Law" in an effort to deprive the defendant in fact of the Constitutional guaranteed rights, due process was systematically denied in the effort of intentionally mis-application of statute.

It is the defendant in fact's posistion, that the alleged violation of the Food and Drug Administration's statute was upon land not subject to the United States territorial jurisdiction. The land in question was not subject to the legislative or administrative authority/jurisdiction of the United States (District of Columbia) (a municipal corporation) that the land in question was/is outside of the Constitutional boundries established; that the court was never sitting in a criminal matter, as there was no injured party, nor a corpus delicti; that the agents of the prosecution did use fraud and mis-representation of law (Color) and

facts to bring the alleged "Indictment(s)" before the alleged "Grand Jury" and "Court"; that this intentional mis-application of statute did cause injury and damage to myself, family and community. (See the attached Memorandum of Law and Table of Authorities, for related case law).

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Hawaii lacked Authority/Jurisdiction whatsoever to prosecute "criminally" the defendant in fact, an American National, Common Law California [C]itizen, who was upon the land of one of the 50 States of the union and not upon United States property. Until and or unless the federal government through its agents, the U.S. prosecutor's office of the Department of Justice can prove (a) exclusive, (b) concurrent, (c) partial, or (d) proprietorial intrest in the land claimed to claim jurisdiction, no federally cognizance of a crime occured. (See additionally U.C.C. file No. 2004-212509).

Further the United States District Courts have no criminal jurisdiction whatsoever vested with it, (See Title 18 § 3231) as being distinct from the "district courts" of the United States, 3 currently, there is absolutely no criminal jurisdiction vested in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, but only the authority vested under Title 28 § 132.

REMEDY DEMANDED

Therefore, the defendant in fact, herein demands that the Article III United States District Court for the District of Hawaii establish its alleged claim to criminal jurisdiction over the land where this alleged criminal activity took place, by producing certified documents consitisting of the following:

(a) Documentation showing "United States", exclusive, concurrent, partial, or proprietorial interest in each and ever geographical location mentioned in the alleged "Indictment", wherein the alleged criminal activity took place; and

(b) Documentation where Hawaii State's Legislature granted, exclusive, concurrent, partial, or proprietorial title and jurisdiction to the United States over the same geographical location as stated above in (a); and

(c) Documentation pursuant to your Title 40 U.S.C. §255; wherein the United States accepted the jurisdiction to the same geographical area, either exclusive, concurrent, partial, or proprietorial interest over that land of Hawaii one of the 50 union states which the alleged criminal activity occurred, (a) above; or

(d) Alternatively, absent the requisite jurisdictional documentation, I, Michael-Trent, the defendant in fact, herein demands that this Article III judge hearing this "Independant Motion Challenging the Claimed Territorial Jurisdiction" dismiss the instant case No. 03-00502-SOM with prejudice in the interest of justice, Nunc Pro Tunc, an initio.

Therefore, the defendant in fact asks that this Court dismiss all charges, ab initio, against the defendant in fact, return all personal property that was seized or attached in this matter as the Plaintiff's counsel has failed the burden of proof "Onus Probendi" to establish any lawful jurisdiction upon which this court might of relied upon to bring this matter.

"Without Prejudice"

Respectfully submitted by: Michael-Trent Barner, in proper persona,
Dated this 8th day of July, 2007 C.E. As Sui Juris, in Pro Se, with
the explicit reservation of all my unalienable birth Righths of an American
National, [C]itizen of the California Republic.

MEMORANDUM OF LAW

JURISDICTION A CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENT

1.] Indisputably, it is the Constitution which sets the limits of the territorial jurisdiction of all branches of the federal government. The United States (a municipal corporation designed to govern the District of Columbia, its territories Guam, Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands, forts, lands and properties it owns, its employees). It is a well established principle of law and fact that "all federal legislation applies only within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States unless a contrary intent appears". Legislative authority/jurisdiction appears in the Constitution at Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, these bounds/limits upon where the Congress has power, Authority, jurisdiction to create the "Laws" in which the Administration and Courts have the authority/jurisdiction to prosecute those laws. See exact wording of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, which granted authority, said authority does not extend everywhere or over the land of the 50 union States.

2.] There is no presumption or assumption in favor of jurisdiction, and the basis of jurisdiction must be affirmatively shown. This long term rule of law applies, and never fades, a court hearing a criminal matter, as in this alleged case No. 03-00502-SOM is always in error if it fails to place its claim to territorial jurisdiction upon the record and is open to attack even years later.

3.] It is axiomatic that the prosecution must prove territorial jurisdiction over a crime in order to sustain a conviction, therefore, The jurisdictional challenge issue can never be waived by the Accused, nor acquiesced by the Accused, in the absent of a positive showing upon the record that the jurisdiction was clearly and unambiguously established.

4.] In principle, the exclusive legislative jurisdiction of the federal government is not addressed to subject matter, but to geographical location.

5.] Without proof of the requisite ownership or possession by the United States, the crime has not been made out. It seem only by "Color of Law, office, authority and process" in the legislative/administrative courts of the United States can we be forced into a status of subject/slave of a foreign municipal corporation, by mere assumption/presumption and thereby be immediately divested of standing in judicio.

6.] In criminal prosecutions, where the federal government is the moving party, it must not only establish ownership of the property upon which the crime was allegedly committed, but it must also produce documentation that the State has ceded to it jurisdiction over the property where the alleged crime was committed.

7.] All courts of justice are duty bound to take judicial notice of the territorial extent of its jurisdiction, although those acts are not formally put into evidence, nor in accord with pleadings.

8.] Where a federal court is without jurisdiction (territorially) of the offense, judgement of conviction of the court and/or jury is void ab initio, on its face.

9.] Federal criminal jurisdiction is never presumed: (except in this instance) it must always be proven: and it can never be waived.

10.] The United States District Court's creation and composition were accomplished by an Act of Congress on June 25th, 1948 [62 Stat. 895], and November 13th, 1963 [77 Stat. 331], currently codified at 28 U.S.C. § 132; and the jurisdiction thereof is listed in Chapter 85 of Title 28, lists civil, admiralty, maritime, patent, bankruptcy, etc... it does not list or mention or describe criminal jurisdiction whatsoever!

11.] Acts of Congress creating the United States District Courts did not vest the said courts with any criminal jurisdiction: these courts only have the authority as vested by Congress under the Constitution.

12.] The United States District Court is not a court of general jurisdiction, has only the power Congress bestowed.

13.] It is apparent that the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii was created and established under the same 28 U.S.C. 132, and its jurisdiction is defined and limited by Congress and the Constitution as stated in Chapter 85 of Title 28, U.S.C., the appropriate jurisdiction for criminal violations is found under Title 18 U.S.C. Section 3231, which specifically names the "district courts of the United States". Yes there is a distinct difference between United States District Courts and District Courts of the United States. The words "District Courts of the United States" commonly describes Constitutional Article III courts, whereas the "United States District Courts" are Article I or Article IV courts created by Congress for its legislative/administrative needs of its territories.

14.] The term "District Court of the United States" commonly describes Article III courts or courts of the United States, and not the legislative/administrative courts for its territories.

15.] Though the judicial system set up in a territory of the United States is a part of federal jurisdiction, the phrase "court of the United States" when used in federal statute is generally construed as not referring to "territorial courts". As the High Court Stated:

The United States District Court is not a true United States court established under Article III of the Constitution to administer the judicial power of the United States therein conveyed. It is created by virtue of the sovereign congressional faculty, granted under Article IV, Section 3, of that instrument, of making all needful rules and regulations respecting the territories belonging to the United States. The resemblance of its jurisdiction to that of a true United States courts in offering an opportunity to non-residents of resorting to a tribunal not subject to local influence, does not change its character as a mere territorial court.

16.] This distinction is the reason why federal jurisdiction over a prosecution is more than a technical concept; it is a Constitutional requirement.

17.] "All federal crimes are statutory." Doble, "Venue and Criminal Cases in the United States District Court," "... [O]n the other hand,

since all Federal Crimes are statutory and all criminal prosecutions in the Federal territorial courts are based upon Acts of Congress". "Act of Congress" includes any act of Congress locally applicable to and in the District of Columbia, in Puerto Rico, in a territory or an insular possession. The fact that no jurisdiction exists with the United States to enforce federal criminal statutes, codes, laws until ownership and consent to accept jurisdiction over acquired lands has been published and filed in behalf of the United States, as provided in Title 40 U.S.C. Section 255, if in fact a State authorized a taking of a criminal prosecution is totally immaterial.

18.] The federal courts are limited both by the Constitution and by Acts of Congress.

19.] The jurisdiction of federal courts is defined in the Constitution at Article III for judicial courts; in Article I for legislative courts; and in Article IV for territorial courts. Some courts created by Acts of Congress have been referred to as "Constitutional Courts", whereas others are regarded as "Legislative Tribunals."

20.] Legislative court judges do not enjoy Article III guarantees; inherently judicial tasks must be performed by judges deriving power under Article III.

21.] "Any person charged with a petty offense may elect, however to be tried in the district court of the United States. The commissioner shall apprise the defendant of his right to make such election and shall not proceed to try the case unless the defendant after being so apprised, signs a written consent to be tried before the commissioner."

22.] "Law enforcement - Where serious crimes are committed.... district courts are available for the detection and prosecution of offenders." The district courts Article I, not District Courts Article III!

23.] "No Federal Legislative Jurisdiction without consent, cession or reservation. - It scarcely need to be said that unless there has been a transfer of jurisdiction (1) pursuant to clause 17 by Federal acquisition of land with State consent or by cession from the State to the Federal Government, or unless the Federal Government has reserved jurisdiction upon the admission of the State, the Federal Government possesses no legislative jurisdiction over any area within a State, such jurisdiction being for exercise entirely by the State,..."

24.] "Necessity of State Assent to Transfer of Jurisdiction to Federal Government: Constitutional consent. - The Federal Government cannot, by unilateral action on its part, acquire legislative jurisdiction over any area within the exterior boundaries of a State."

25.] Limitations on Areas Over Which Jurisdiction May Be Acquired by Consent of State Under Clause 17 ... They exclude from its purview places which were not purchased by the Federal Government, ..."

26. "...since the amendment of section 355 of the Revised Statutes of the United States on February 1, 1940, which provided for formal acceptance in order to establish Federal jurisdiction" " ... any such jurisdiction, involves Federal questions,..."

27.] "U.S. v. Tully, 140 Fed 899 (1905); It is unfortunate that a murderer should go unwhipped of justice, but it would be yet more unfortunate if any court should assume to try one charged with a crime without jurisdiction of the offence ... it is upon the judgement and conscience of this court that the matter of jurisdiction must be decided."

28.] "The Constitution withholds froms Congress a plenary police power ... We always have rejected readings of the Commerce Clause and scope of federal power that would permit Congress to exercise police power."

29.] Act of Congress is defined and confined to "locally applicable to and in force in District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, in a territory or

insular possessions"

30.] Definition of: "State" by the definition the federal statutes for which the defendant in fact was "Indicted, Arrested, and convicted in the United States District Court for Hawaii were not even cognizable.

31.] No Public Law exists in which Congress constituted the United States District Court to "possess the judicial powers and exercise the jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States as exists for the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico district courts. Contary to the claim of the United States District Court's claim of jurisdiction, both the Constitution's Article III and the Judiciary Act of 1789, Statute I § 9 deprives the District Court of that jurisdiction and secondly, by the plain language of 18 U.S.C. § 3231, it is the "district courts of the United States" shall have "original over all criminal proceedings in the United States district courts".

32.] United States District Courts limited jurisdiction for only civil suits is a matter of stare decisis. "The Constitution Article 3 § 2 limits the exercise of judicial power to cases and controversies. The term controversies, if distinguishable at all from 'cases', is so in that it is less comrehensive than the latter, and includes only suits of a civil nature."

33.] "Article 3 Courts are law courts, equity courts, They sit to determine cases and controversies. But Article I courts have no such restrictions. They need not be confined to cases of controversies of Article III, but can dispense legislative largesse."

34.] When the United States District Court, exercised the district court of the United States outside of the clear territorial jurisdiction laid out for the United States in Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 it was "usurpation of judicial power".

35.] Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3401, the Judges of the United States

courts are required to proceed in all criminal proceedings under the Rules as promulgated by the Supreme Court, which Rule 1 (a) (1) provides: "These rules govern in all criminal proceedings", but thereafter, has no provisions with which the United States District Courts, Article III Courts could have adjudicated statutory violations confined to district courts of the United States Article I courts.

36.] The definition of "State" will specifically "include state of the United States". § 513 (5), this Title 18 federal statute is for violations justiciable in a "district court of the United States". Yet when Title 18 § 921 based allegedly upon the interstate or foreign commerce clause, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia and other federal states defined by Rule 1 (b) (9), but does not include a "state of the United States". The prosecution under "Color of law, authority, and process" did deceive the Grand Jury into issuing indictment(s) which seem to be founded on a convenient disregard for the word "include" as to what the government's jurisdictional area is "included" for exercise of its statutory authority. Title 18 § 5 description of the United States, is the same as that of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 the same as thought out its history and is further corroborated by your FCrRP Rule 54 (c) "Act of Congress" (a federal statute) "Includes any act of Congress locally applicable to and in force in the District of Columbia ..." The Supreme Court clarified any misinterpretation of the word "include". "Include or the participial form thereof is defined to comprise within, to hold, to contain, shut up, and synonyms are enclose, contain ..." Therefore, due to the fact that the federal statutes for which the defendant in fact was accused, by Title 18's definitions did not "include" the geographical location in which the alleged criminal activity took place. By the doctrine of "inclusio unius est exclusio alterius" the Statutes were not justiciable by the U.S. Attorney's office in the alleged Plaintiff.

37.] The Supreme Court in distinguishing between an Article I court, the district courts of the United States, and Article III United States District Courts" further held: " ... an Article I court could make its adjudications without regard to the limitations of Article III. On the other hand, as the Court in *O'Donoghue v. United States*, supra observed, Article III Courts could not be endowed with the administrative and legislative powers which Article I tribunals or agencies exercise."

38.] Historically the only Statutes to be enforced Nationally required an amendment to the Constitution similar to that of the Eighteenth Amendment, At this time, no Amendment of the Constitution exists to authorize statutory authority which would authorize U.S. Attorney's to enforce federal statutes which are legislated only for Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 territories of the United States. Even if this was true the only courts cognizable of crimes, statute violations are the district courts of the United States Article I courts, Not District Courts of the United States Article III courts of civil jurisdiction.

39.] By claiming the matter/case as criminal the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii displayed a persistent disregard for rules laid out by the Supreme Court as promulgated. Also violated the sworn Oath of Office and failed the test of continuing service for good conduct, for the presiding Judge as they should understand their total lack of lawful authority to hear "criminal matters".

"Without Prejudice"

Respectfully submitted by: Michael Trent Barnes, In Proper Persona,
Dated this ^{8th} day of July, 2007 C.E. AS: Sui Juris, in Pro Se, with the explicit reservation of all my unalienable birth Rights of an American National, [C]itizen of the California Republic.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

MEMORANDUM OF LAW

JURISDICTION A CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENT

- 1.] Constitution for the united States of America 1787 C.E. and the Bylaws of the municipal corporation's Constitution of the United States a for profit corporation 1871 c.e.
- 2.] Hanford v. Davis, 16 S.Ct. 1051, 163 U.S. 273, 41 L.Ed. 157 (1896).
- 3.] U.S. v. Benson, 495 F.2d. 475 at 481 (1974).
- 4.] U.S. v. Bevans, 16 U.S. (3 Wheat) 336 (1818).
- 5.] U.S. v. Watson, 80 Fed. Supp. 649 (1948, E.D. Va.).
- 6.] Fort Leavenworth Railway Co. v. Iowa, 114 U.S. 525 at 531 (1885).
- 7.] Jones v. U.S., 137 U.S. 202, 11 S.Ct. 80 (1890).
- 8.] Bauman v. U.S., 156 F.2d 534 (5th Cir. 1946).
- 9.] U.S. v. Rogers, 23 Fed. 658 (D.C., W.D. Ark., 1885).
- 10.] See creation of U.S.S.D.C., 62 Stat. 895, 77 Stat. 331, 28 U.S.C. Chapter 85 & 132 & Title 18 U.S.S.C. Chapter 5, 7, & 3231.
- 11.] Hubbard v. Ammerman, 465 F.2d. 1169 (5th Cir., 1976).
- 12.] Graves v. Snead, 541 F.2d 159 (6th Cir., 1976).
- 13.] International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union v. Juneau Spruce Corp., 342 U.S. 237 at 241 (1952), 72 S.Ct. 235, 96 L.Ed. 276, Alaska 536.
- 14.] American Insurance Co. v. 356 Bales of Cotton, 1 Pet. 511 (1882), 7 L.Ed. 242; International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union v. Wirts, 170 F.2d. 183 (9th Cir., 1948), cert. den. 336 U.S. 919, 93 L.Ed. 1082, 69 S.Ct. 641, reh. den. 336 U.S. 971, 93 L.Ed. 1121, 69 S.Ct. 936.
- 15.] Balzac v. Puerto Rico, 258 U.S. 298 at 312 (1921), 42 S.Ct. 343, 66 L.Ed. 627.
- 16.] U.S. v. Johnson, 337 F.2d 180, aff'd 383 U.S. 169 (1966), 86 S.Ct. 749, 15 L.Ed. 2d. 77, 117.

- 17.] Virginia Law Review, 287, 289, (1926). Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure Rule 54, (c). Adams v. United States, 319 U.S. 312, 63 S. Ct. 1122, 87 L.Ed. 1421 (1943).
- 18.] Owen Equip. & Erection Co. v. Kroger, 98 S.Ct. 2396, 437 U.S. 365, 57 L.Ed. 2d. 274 (1943).
- 19.] O'Donoghue v. U.S., 289 U.S. 516 (1933), 77 L.Ed. 1356, 53 S.Ct. 74; Mookini v. U.S., 303 U.S. 201 at 205 (1936), 82 L.Ed. 748, 58 S.Ct. 543.
- 20.] U.S. v. Sadlers 641 F.2d 659 (1981), cert. den. 101 S.Ct. 3055, 452 U.S. 918, 69 L.Ed 422.
- 21.] Title 18 U.S.C. § 3401 (b)
- 22.] United States Government Printing Office Book "Jurisdiction over Federal Areas within the States" (1956 Part 1) "Facts and Committee Recommendations". Page 52
- 23.] United States Government Printing Office Book "Jurisdiction over Federal Areas within the States" (1957 Part 2) "A Text of the Law of Legislative Jurisdiction" Page 45.
- 24.] Above refferenced Book on Jurisdiction in 23 above Page 46.
- 25.] Above refferenced Book on Jurisdiction in 23 above Pages 66 & 67.
- 26.] Above refferenced Book on Jurisdiction in 23 above Pages 81 & 82.
- 27.] Above refferenced Book on Jurisdiction in 23 above Pages 107 & 108.
- 28.] U.S. v. Morrison 146 L Ed 2d 676, citing U.S. v. Lopez 514 US at 596-597.
- 29.] FCrRP 54 (c)
- 30.] Title 18 USC § 5, Rule 6 & Rule 1 (b) (9) FCrRP.
- 31.] FCrCP Rule 1 (b) (9), Rule 54 (c) Title 18 § 5 and 7, Article III and the Judiciary Act of 1787.
- 32.] U.S. Constitution Article III Section 2.
- 33.] Aetna Life v. Haworth (1937) 300 U.S. 227, Citing Chisholm v. Georgia 1 L Ed 44 U, 452. Page 2 of 3 of 18 Total

34.] See Will v. United States 19 L Ed 2d 305, 310.

35.] 18 U.S.C § 3401, and Rule 1 (a) (1) ECrRP.

36.] Title 18 U.S.C. § 513 (5), Title 18 U.S.C. § 921, Montello Salt v. Utah 221 U.S. 452, 455, 456.

37.] Glidden v. Zdanok 8 L Ed 2d at 715, citing O'Donoghue v. United States 287 U.S. at 546.

Respectfully submitted by: Michael Trent Barnes, In Proper Persona,
Dated this 8th day of July, 2007 C.E. AS: Sui Juris, in Pro Se, with
the explicit reservation of all my unalienable birth Rights of an American
National, [C]itizen of the California Republic.